

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

I. Status of the Claims

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7, 17, and 65-77 remain pending.

Applicants note that the statements on pages 5-6 of the Office action that all the previous rejections under §102 and 102 have been withdrawn.

Applicants further note the statements on page 8 of the Office action that claims 1-7, 65-71, and 74-77, as well as claims 17 and 73-73 define over the prior art of record.

And applicants note the statements on page 9 of the Office action that claims 75-77 would be allowable if amended to overcome the claim objections, and that claims 72-73 and 75-77 would be allowable if amended to overcome the §112 rejections.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112 and Claim Objections

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections stated on pages 2-3 of the Office action of claims 76 and 77 under §112 with respect to their recitations of "copper ion in a proportion between about 10 g/L and about 50 g/L," and "between about 59 g/L and about 75 g/L copper sulfate pentahydrate." The Office states on page 3 of the Office action there is insufficient written description to support these recitations. The Office goes on to state, "However, there is sufficient written description for ... **a copper sulfate concentration as the pentahydrate of 59 to 75 g/l.**" Moreover, the specification has literal support at page 13, line 22 (paragraph 40 of 2003/0168343) for "on the order of 10 g/L to on the order of 50 g/L." In order to expedite prosecution, applicants have amended

the claims as suggested by the Office to include the precise supported language. Withdrawal of these rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

The §112 rejection of claims 70 and 73 has been withdrawn, as stated on page 4 of the Office action.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections stated on page 4 of the Office action of claims 75-77 under §112 with respect to their recitations of "comprises copper ion" and "comprises copper sulfate." The Office stated that it is unclear whether there are two copper sources in the bath, the copper ion and the ionic copper ... "or are they the same?" These claims have been amended to underscore that the copper ion *is the ionic copper* and that the copper sulfate is a *source of the ionic copper*. This clarifies that they are the same. Withdrawal of these rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is requested of the objections stated on page 7 of the Office action with respect to the recitation in claims 75-77 of "*A process as set forth in claim 65....*" These claims have been amended to properly refer to the *method* of claim 65. Withdrawal of these objections is therefore respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejections stated on page 8 of the Office action of claims 72 and 73 under §112 with respect to their recitations of "said overall sulfur content" as lacking antecedent basis. However, these claims depend from claim 1, which expressly refers to "an overall sulfur content" in the second clause:

immersing the semiconductor integrated circuit device substrate into an electroplating bath including ionic copper, a suppressor, an accelerator, and an effective amount of a defect reducing agent to increase an overall chloride content and ***an overall***

sulfur content of the copper deposit, wherein the defect reducing agent is a reaction product of benzyl chloride and hydroxyethyl polyethylenimine;

Withdrawal of these rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and early allowance of all claims 1-7, 17, and 65-77 are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/paul fleischut/

Paul I. J. Fleischut, Reg. No. 35,513
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

PIF/axj